

64

16th June, 1959.COCOM Document No. 3571COORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONUNITED KINGDOM PROPOSAL TO EXPORT AIRBORNE NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT
TO THE SOVIET ZONE OF GERMANY.12th June, 1959.

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan,
Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM 3510, 3543, 3559.

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting (COCOM 3559) the United Kingdom Delegate had given further technical information about the equipment concerned. He invited Delegates to give the further views of their authorities.
2. The ITALIAN Delegate said that after careful consideration his authorities were not in favour of the United Kingdom request because of the highly strategic characteristics of the equipment involved and the possibility that it might be used for the production of military aircraft. They would be, however, prepared to consider any further information the United Kingdom might wish to put forward.
3. The GERMAN Delegate stated that the views of his authorities were still unfavourable. They had taken into account the statement made by the United Kingdom Delegate at the previous meeting but had found no grounds for altering their position.
4. The FRENCH Delegate said that his authorities had studied the additional information provided by the United Kingdom but they were not in favour of this export because it was destined for installation in prototype aircraft.
5. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that his authorities appreciated the additional information which had been provided but they had found nothing in it to make them modify their original view. They felt that this important contribution of strategic equipment was not outweighed by any considerations advanced in favour of the export.
6. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that in previous discussions of this request some Delegations had stated that they were not in favour of assisting the development of the aircraft industry in the Soviet Bloc. This was a general economic reason outside the scope of the Committee's terms of reference. The information which had been given at the previous meeting showed that the equipment concerned would be useless for installation in military aircraft and there was thus no possibility that it might be installed even in the development stage. The equipment in question was admittedly on List I but his authorities would have been justified in permitting this export if it had been sold with a complete aircraft and had fallen within the terms of the exclusion clauses of the items concerned. His authorities had sought the views of the Committee because this export did not fall within the usual framework for questions of this kind. The Delegate asked the Members of the Committee to reconsider their answers in the light of these comments.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

CCCOM Document No. 3571

7. The GERMAN Delegate agreed that at the previous meeting he had stated that his authorities did not wish to give any assistance to the development of the aircraft industry in the Soviet Bloc but he drew the attention of his United Kingdom colleague to the previous sentence in the German statement (CCCOM 3559, paragraph 4) referring to the fact that Item 1501 covered all airborne equipment of certain specifications whether of civil or military application. He undertook to report the comments of the United Kingdom Delegate to his authorities but doubted that the latter could change their position.
8. The FRENCH Delegate said that the Notes to Item 1501 permitted certain exclusions provided that the equipment was installed in Bloc aircraft which participated in scheduled commercial flights to Free World destinations, thus they referred only to aircraft actually in service and not to aircraft at the development stage. He undertook to refer the United Kingdom Delegate's comments back to his authorities but he doubted that his instructions would be changed.
9. The UNITED STATES Delegate commented on the references to helping the aircraft industry of the Soviet Bloc. This could be alleged to be an economic consideration but it was a valid CCCOM argument because of the vital importance of the aircraft industry in the Soviet Bloc, bearing in mind especially that the Bloc's aircraft production capacity was overwhelmingly devoted to military production.
10. The COMMITTEE agreed to continue the discussion on June 22nd.

C O N F I D E N T I A L